



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,029	08/20/2001	Kimikazu Matsumoto	KUW.025	5229

7590 11/24/2003
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
Suite 200
8321 Old Courthouse Road
Vienna, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

RAO, SHRINIVAS H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2814

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/932,029

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO, KIMIKAZU

Examiner

Steven H. Rao

Art Unit

2814

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action, or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-27

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

SU

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicants' have amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to recite "selected to be " instead of "falling" thus Not narrowing/changing the scope of the claims (see also remarks page 10 lines 4- 6). The recitation, " for improving a luminance of said in-plane switching type LCD unit " is taken to be a product by process limitation and not given patentable weight (See In re Fessman, In re Klug, etc.). Further even assuming arguendo that patentable weight is given, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus (device) is intended to be employed (" for improving a luminance of said in-plane switching type LCD unit ") does not differentiate the claimed apparatus (device) from a prior art apparatus (device) satisfying the claimed structural limitations. (See Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Yamakita as previously pointed out teaches Spray Elastic constant of 9 and 12 pN for improving a luminance of said in-plane switching type liquid crystal display by forming a transparent electrode which allows more areas to be displayed and improving transmittance and luminance and the motivation provided therein (final rejection page 3 -first full paragraph, etc)

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that liquid crystal regions include liquid crystal material. Yamakita in the above cited portions of the Final rejection clearly establishes the relationship between improved luminance (high luminance, e.g. para 0025 of Yamakita) and physical properties including spray elastic coefficient.

Lastly it is noted that Applicants' state on page 10 that claims 13-18 was allowable if rewritten in independent form .However the final action does not indicate allowability of these claims.